

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

32

Support for claim amendments in claim 82 and 99 is provided as follows: "different probes," p. 87, line 22, "single interrogation position"; p. 18, line 21, "reference sequence of at least 50 bases" p. 16, line 37, overlapping probes, p. p21, line 37. Claim 85 has been rewritten in independent form including the elements from the base claim on which it previously depended. These amendments should not be construed as an acquiescence in any ground of rejection.

**Drawings**

The enclosed thirty-three replacement sheets of formal drawings replace the thirty-three sheets of original drawings. As these replacement sheets merely correct informalities of margins, lines and characters, they do not contain new matter.

**Prior Art**

Claims 82-84 and 88-91 stand rejected as anticipated by Mundy. Mundy is said to describe an array of two different probes, each present in multiple copies. The two probes are plasmids pAT153 and pBR322 which are said to differ at position 1649. This rejection is respectfully traversed, particularly as applied to the amended claims.

Claim 82 as amended specifies a first probe set comprising at least two different overlapping probes spanning at least 50 bases. Each of these probes has a corresponding probe in the second probe, differing at a single position, namely, the interrogation position. Mundy only discusses two different probes. Mundy does not disclose or suggest additional probes such as to conform with the requirements of the claimed arrays.

Claim 88 specifies an array having one perfectly matched probe with a plurality of interrogation positions, and three mismatched probes for each interrogation position. The three mismatched probes differ from each other and the perfectly matched probe at an interrogation position. Therefore, claim 88 requires a minimum of seven probes, at least four of

Appl. No. 09/510,378  
Amtd. dated October 27, 2003  
Reply to Office Action of June 26, 2003

PATENT

which are different from one another. As the Examiner acknowledges, Mundy discusses only two different probes. Mundy does not disclose or suggest the additional probes of the claimed arrays. Mundy also does not disclose or suggest that analysis of multiple interrogation positions recited in step (b) of claim 88 be performed.

Claim 90 has been amended to contain the same elements as claim 82 and is distinguished for the same reasons.

Claim 85 was objected to as depending from a rejected claim but was otherwise indicated as allowable. Claim 85 has been amended to incorporate the elements from the base claim.

For these reasons, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,



Joe Liebeschuetz  
Reg. No. 37,505

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP  
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-3834  
Tel: 650-326-2400  
Fax: 415-576-0300  
Attachments  
JOL:klc  
60067514 v1